UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,409	08/10/2001	David Hitz	103.1019.10	7457

22883	7590	06/07/2005

SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC
P.O. BOX 390013
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

EXAMINER
GYORFI, THOMAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/927,409	HITZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tom Gyorfi	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 March 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *31-50 and 57-60* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *31-50 and 57-60* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 31-50 and 57-60 remain for examination. The correspondence filed

3/18/05 amended claims 40, 57 and 58; added claims 59 and 60; and cancelled claims

5 l-56.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed 3/18/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s)

31-50 and 57-58 under the Montague reference alone have been fully considered and

are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Montague and

PartitionMagic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 31-37, 40-50, 53, and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Montague et al. (U.S. Patent 5,761,669), and further in view of the

PartitionMagic 4.0 web page (dated 5/8/99; hereinafter "PartitionMagic").

Regarding claims 31 and 43:

        Montague discloses a method of operating a file server, including steps of

identifying a file on said file server with a first security style selected from among a

plurality of security styles corresponding to a plurality of operating systems implemented

on said file server (Fig. 3 and col. 13, line 60 – col. 14, line 42); and enforcing said first

security style for all accesses to said file including accesses in another one of said

plurality of security styles (col. 14, lines 42-60).

Although it is unclear from the Montague disclosure whether the plurality of

operating systems are resident on the same server, it was well known in the art that

multiple operating systems could be implemented on a single file server. Evidence for

this assertion is found in the PartitionMagic web site, which discloses a product that

facilitates the creation of multiple partitions on a single hard drive in order to run multiple

operating systems on the same PC (page 1, "Safely run multiple operating systems on

the same PC"). Also note that Windows NT and Linux (a DCE-compliant Unix, see

below) are two operating systems that are explicitly taught as being able to be

simultaneously present (page 2, "Complete support for FAT, FAT32, NTFS, HPFS, and

Linux ext2 file systems"). It would have been obvious to allow the use of a plurality of

operating systems on a single file server as disclosed by Montague. The motivation for

doing so would be to efficiently organize operating systems, programs, and data

(PartitionMagic, page 1, 1st paragraph).

Regarding claim 34:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 31 above.

Montague further discloses wherein said enforcing step enforces said security style for

all accesses to the file regardless of the security style associated with the entity who

seeks access to the file (col. 14, lines 45-60; col. 6, lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 35:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 31 above.

Montague further discloses associating said file with a subset of files in a file system

and limiting said subset of files to a security subset of said plurality of security style (Fig.

3, in particular elements 72 and 74, and the unlabeled drive icons); wherein attempts to

set permission in said subset of files are restricted to said security subset (col. 2, lines

25-30). Examiner contends that, due at least in part to the established differences in

handling access permissions among varying operating systems, it is inherent to the

disclosed invention that each drive as illustrated in Figure 3 represents one file system

wherein all files contained on a given drive necessarily share the same security style,

dependent on which operating system said drive was originally formatted for.

Regarding claim 40:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 40 above.

Montague further discloses identifying said file with a second security style with a file

server request for setting permissions for said file when said file server request is

successful (col. 14, lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 41:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 40 above.

Montague further discloses associating said second security style with a file server

request for setting permissions for said file when said file server request is successful

(col. 14, lines 24-27 and also lines 35-40).

Regarding claim 42:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 40 above.

Montague further discloses wherein said file is associated with said second security

style regardless of the security style previously associated with said file (element 210 of

Figure 9).

Regarding claim 46:

Montague discloses a file server including a subtree of files in said file system

associated with a security subset of said plurality of security styles (Figure 3), wherein

said file server restricts attempts to set permission in said subtree to said security

subset (col. 7, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 49:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 43 above.

Montague further discloses wherein said file server is capable of altering the security

style associated with said file in response to a file server request (col. 14, lines 49-53).

Regarding claim 50:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 49 above.

Montague further discloses wherein said file server is capable of altering the security

style associated with said file in response to a file server request when said file server

request is successful (col. 14, lines 50-60).

Regarding claims 32, 36, 44, and 47:

Montague discloses the limitations found in claims 31, 35, 43, and 46 above.

Montague further discloses a Windows NT security style (col. 6, lines 1-15).

Regarding claims 33, 37, 45, and 48:

Montague discloses the limitations found in claims 31, 35, 43, and 46 above.

Montague further discloses a Unix security style (col. 6, lines 1-15).

Regarding claims 57 and 58:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claims 31 and 43

above. Montague further discloses translating access control limits for said file to a first

security style associated with said accesses (col. 7, lines 50-65).

5.   Claims 38-39 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Montague and PartitionMagic as applied to claim 31 above, and

further in view of Schmuck et al. (U.S. Patent 5,893,086).

Regarding claim 38:

        Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claim 35 above.

However, neither Montague nor PartitionMagic explicitly disclose caching associations

and limits for the subsets of files for future use.

        Schmuck discloses caching associations and limits for the subset of files for

future use (col. 28, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention were made to include the ability to cache the ACLs (or

their equivalent associations and limits) for future use into the invention by Montague.

The motivation to do so would be to speed up access to the permission data by

avoiding additional disk I/O.

Regarding claim 39:

        Montague in view of PartitionMagic in view of Schmuck discloses or suggests the

limitations of claim 38 above.   Montague also discloses mapping permissions in said

first security style to a second security style, and wherein said mapping can be

performed dynamically or statically (col. 7, lines 50-65).

Regarding claims 59 and 60:

Montague and PartitionMagic disclose all the limitations of claims 31 and 43

above. However, neither reference explicitly discloses caching the translation of an

access control list to access permissions.

Schmuck discloses the ability to cache access control lists (col. 28, lines 60-65).

Given that access control lists are a data structure to store access permissions about

files, this passage offers the suggestion that such data structures can be cached. Thus,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to cache the translation of the access control list structure after it has been

transformed by the invention disclosed by Montague. The motivation for doing so would

be to speed up access to the permission data by avoiding additional disk I/O (Ibid).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure: Distributed Computing Environment (DCE) for Linux Frequently

Asked Questions (FAQ). http://jrr.ne.mediaone.net/FAQ/FAQ.html (copy supplied by

Internet Archive at http://web.archive.org, dated 4/21/99)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tom Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3849.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TAG
5/31/05

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100